

Shorewood School District Ad Hoc Building Committee

Summary Minutes

June 3, 2015 Minutes

- Members Present:
 - Kathryn Kamm, Ruth McGuire, Patrick Miller, Tony Seidita, Cliff Tisser, David Cobb

- Background:
 - Did a campus review – walked through every building
 - Review showed that buildings are on the brink of a major overhaul
 - Capital Improvement Budget has declined significantly - \$300k to \$80K
 - There are a lot of major questions to address
 - Industrial Use Building for STEAM [Which building is this?]
 - Architectural Integrity
 - Sustainability / Long Range Maintenance [Should this be a separate item?]
 - Pedagogic Impact
 - Aesthetics
 - Emergency Repairs

- Committee Member Comments:
 - Cliff:
 - Committee has split purpose
 - Major and recurring maintenance items
 - Planning for 21st century education
 - Advisable to have knowledgeable teacher and principal on the committee
 - Kathryn:
 - Process tends to go circular
 - Hone in the scope of the project
 - Loosely identified before we approach architectural group
 - Pick out some user groups and talk with them before architecture – ground work done
 - Facilities maintenance side
 - Earmark extra money to catch up
 - Track yearly expenses
 - Build into the budget
 - Her question
 - Where are we with regard to ongoing budget items
 - Patrick
 - Ask for a certain amount to catch up with maintenance
 - We are about 4 years away from a major referendum opportunity (~\$11+M)– debt is falling off

Shorewood School District Ad Hoc Building Committee

Summary Minutes

- Maintain our buildings for next 4 years to catch up, then do the referendum.
 - 2015 – 2019 (maintenance plan to get us from 2015 – 2019, then have a referendum in 2019)
 - ??? 2015/16 Referendum for non-recurring authority to exceed revenue caps ???
 - Do same for 2019 – 2024 and 2024 to 2029.
- Ruth:
 - We are at 30,000 feet.
 - How do we establish priorities?
 - Technology versus aesthetics for example
 - Policy decisions
 - Security issues – because of campus layout
 - We bring questions about security and technology to the Board for scope
- Questions to Address:
 - What is our timing cycle?
 - Examine debt and when debt falls off of balance sheet:
 -
 - What is impact of village initiatives?
 - What is overall taxing capacity for village and schools?
 - i.e. – sewer work
 - What steps do we take to assess needs?
 - Interview and discernment process for defined user groups
 - What, with regard to district needs, is handled internally and what is handled by contractor?
 - Community priorities can be done internally
 - Have an architectural firm come through and do a maintenance analysis plan as part of the plan.
 - Work with Architecture firm to outline scope of the project
 - Do we do this in phases?
 - Revenue Streams?
 - What other revenue sources are possible (e.g. MMSD)?
 - Grants can be very challenging and competitive
 - In the recommendation we are asked to identify people in the standing committee – teachers, administrators, etc.
 - Do we need someone from the village?
 - Faculty?
 - STEAM representative?
 - Others?
- Board Presentation Requirements:
 - Create core principles that guide our recommendation

Shorewood School District Ad Hoc Building Committee Summary Minutes

- Define current state of building and capital funding support
- Provide the “why” of the project
 - Why it is important and why now?
- Define goal and scope of project
- Recommend qualities and skills necessary to participate in planning committee
 - Include specific people, if possible
- **Next Steps:**
 - **Meet on Friday, June 12th – 8am**
 - **Define goal, scope and why of project**

Shorewood School District Ad Hoc Building Committee

Summary Minutes

June 12, 2015 Minutes

Attendees: Kathryn Kamm, Ruth McGuire, Patrick Miller, Tony Sedita, Cliff Tisser, David Cobb

When and how will Board make decisions about strategic factors that impact Ad Hoc Committee?

STEM/STEAM

Help push the new Superintendent in a vision

Board needs to provide direction otherwise community will have too much noise

Funding Model

Funding for new committee

Architectural

Technology

Our Goal:

- Map a process for the work of the cross functional building project team which includes:
 - Money
 - Community engagement
 - Maintenance
 - Education

Three components to this approach:

- Money
 - Funding model
- Engage Community for Buy-in
- Educational Component – what are the needs
 - Priorities
- Ongoing Maintenance
- Current state – what is working and what is not
- Future State
 - A picture of handling scope

Components of Presentation:

- Goal
 - Include examples of stories of other school districts: athletic field; Marquette
- Scope
- Questions for Board
- Success Requirements

Shorewood School District Ad Hoc Building Committee

Summary Minutes

- Funding Model
- Committee Structure for Thing 2
- Timeline
 - Funding
 - Referendum
 - Met with user groups
 - Issue RFP – and completion of RFP

Communication Plan

Decision Process Line

Conceptual Rendering (suggestion for next committee)

Questions for Board to Answer

- STEM/STEAM
- Affirmative Statement that district requires comprehensive renovation for School District Facilities (Have our Back)
- Funding commitment for ongoing maintenance
 - May require referendum to exceed revenue limit on an ongoing basis to ensure Building
- Free up major referendum dollars for major renovation which requires money for maintenance – create a fund for ongoing maintenance
 - Equalization aid
- Funding for “Thing 2”
 - Assessment by Architecture
 - User Groups – Architectural Design Firm
 - Maintenance Plan
- Board Representation on Thing 2 – role is key
- Security issues for campus design

Committee Members

- Subject Matter Experts used as needed
 - Technology
 - Security
 - Curriculum
 - Village Member (Trustee?)
 - TED
 - Recreation
 - Communication
 - Libraries/Information Systems
- Core Committee
 - Board Representative
 - Faculty
 - PTO who communicates to other PTOs
 - Administrator (Tim Kenney)
 - New Superintendent (Ad Hoc)

Shorewood School District Ad Hoc Building Committee Summary Minutes

Next Steps and Responsibilities:

Send Board Presentation – July 8th

Review Presentation with Board - Second July meeting

Decision on Ad Hoc Committee recommendation – August 11th Board meeting

Kathryn – flow chart

Patrick Costs – Estimate of cost to do assessments and where

David – Contact Paru

Where will seed money come from! Need to define.

Shorewood School District Ad Hoc Building Committee

Summary Minutes

June 19, 2015 Minutes

Attendees: Kathryn Kamm, Ruth McGuire, Patrick Miller, Tony Sedita, Cliff Tisser, David Cobb

Mil rate discussion -

Patrick's presentation – Kit would be willing to talk with us about the cost of assessment/planning and design. There is an option to bundle. Bundling will save some money and depends on community's appetite for referenda. We can contract with the firm to handle all of the phases without a full commitment to the phases provided we use the same firm.

A greater amount of the cost can be put into the referendum and only a small percentage done up front.

Kathryn's material – prepare a visual that shows the linkage between major improvements and ongoing maintenance.

Cliff's comment – ongoing maintenance is a more pressing issue – needs to be part of an ongoing referendum

Firm would come in 2015-16 and do a maintenance assessment – leads to dollar value.

Board commitment - \$15,000 up front.

Goal – define for committee their objective and process. Thing 2 needs to come up with a plan for ongoing major maintenance.

Board needs to know the factors that will come up and need to be addressed by the firm.
Technology and Security

Next steps –

Fine tune costs

Visual

Goal

Shorewood School District Ad Hoc Building Committee

Summary Minutes

June 30, 2015 Minutes

Eric Dufek – Eppstein Uhen Architects

- When the project is Board led it may take longer
- Timeline:
 - 18-24 months to build the master plan before going to referendum
 - Referendum Timing
 - Even year – February, April, November
 - Odd year – Spring
 - Historically, November referendum are most successful but not best for architectural companies

Timeline:

- Arch RFP – 6 weeks
- Facility study – 4-5 months
 - Snapshot in time – not community feedback sessions
 - Current State assessment - Question? How do we design the solution to allow for upgrade costs and new design costs
- Board Presentation
 - Conversation about next steps
- A second RFP if we don't hire the same company
 - Oak Creek – sets asides 1.2mm per year for capital improvements
- Master planning – 5-8 months
 - Supported by the current state study
 - Need to have the philosophical vision from new super and admin as part of the beginning of master planning
 - Figure out how to have an updated enrollment study
 - Use wording – modern learning environment – significant input from younger teachers and those who really engage students
 - **Menasha is a good example for Shorewood to follow**
 - Includes an invitation to cross section of the community
 - Need to include representative from various cohorts
 - Survey is done at the end of master planning – 2 months
 - Gets feedback from everyone in community
 - Do they want to invest
 - Define Scope as need not aesthetic
 - What is looks like comes after the referendum is approved
- From survey the School Board defines a resolution
 - Scope of project of maintenance and building improvements
 - 73 days prior to election – minimum
- Community engagement
 - Referendum (Sarah)

Emotional Engagement:

Shorewood School District Ad Hoc Building Committee Summary Minutes

- Project works best if administration drives the project
- Get Brian engaged and supporting this initiative
- Present a progress report at July meeting to Board
- Explain how the schools were designed in 1920 to educate elementary schools. To teach for 2015 here is what is needed to attract young families
- The most important people are Super and Business Director

Costs:

- The cost of getting to referendum is \$250k for architectural firm – their cost. But they will charge a total of \$90k with hope of getting final contract to lead the project\
- The cost for getting to the end of the current state study is \$45k for architectural firm
- The cost for master plan - \$45k